

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/517,424	BEZZEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Alexander Tumminelli	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ALEXA D. NECKEL. (3) Obert Chu (reg. no. 52,744).
 (2) ALEXANDER TUMMINELLI. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 December 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible amendments to overcome the 112 2nd paragraph rejections. Mr. Chu described the invention and how it is different than the solar cell of the applied prior art. The examiners suggested clarifying the transparent and non-transparent areas to structurally distinguish the invention from the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ALEXA D. NECKEL
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER